DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 562 FL 016 115

AUTHOR Fisher, Charles W.; Guthrie, Larry F.
TITLE The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO SBIF-83-R.14
PUB DATE Dec 83
CONTRACT 400-80-0026
NOTE 24p.; For related documents, see FL 016 113-120.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; Basic Skills; Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Education Programs; Classroom Communication; *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Cubans; Cultural Awareness; Educational Assessment; English (Second Language); Ethnic Groups; Filipino Americans; Hispanic Americans; *Language of Instruction; Mexican Americans; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Puerto Ricans; Scheduling; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Influence; *Teaching Styles; Vietnamese People
IDENTIFIERS Chinese People; Navajo (Nation)

ABSTRACT

The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) study identified, described, and verified features of bilingual instruction of a wide variety of limited English proficient students. It collected data on instructional organization, time allocation, classroom language use, active teaching behaviors, academic learning time, student participation styles, and classroom, school, and community context variables through a variety of quantitative and qualitative procedures. Part I involved the study of 58 classrooms and 232 students at six sites representing different ethnolinguistic (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Cantonese, and Navajo) and multilinguistic groups. The classrooms were nominated for their success as settings for bilingual instruction. The instructional features identified as significant in this portion of the study include (1) congruence of instructional intent, (2) use of active teaching behaviors, (3) use of the students' native language and English for instruction, (4) integration of English language development with basic skills development, and (5) use of information from the students' home culture. Part II of the study verified the prevalence of those features in a second sample of 89 classrooms and 356 students at eight sites, including new sites representing Filipino, Vietnamese, and Hispanic ethnolinguistic groups. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297562

SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: THE SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES STUDY

by
Charles W. Fisher
and
Larry F. Guthrie

Document SBIF-83-R.14
December 1983

FL 016 115

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report is one of a series produced for the

SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES STUDY

by the National Consortium for SBIF:

ARC Associates

CEMREL, Inc.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

Florida State University

Hunter College of CUNY

Navajo Division of Education

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

University of Hawaii

This document has been produced under Contract No. 400-80-0026 between the National Institute of Education, Department of Education, and the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. The opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Institute, the Department, or the Laboratory.

ABSTRACT

The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) study was designed to identify, describe, and verify features of bilingual instruction for a wide variety of limited English proficient (LEP) students. Data for the study were collected through a variety of qualitative and quantitative procedures resulting in information on organization of instruction, allocation of time, language use, active teaching behaviors, academic learning time, student participation styles, and classroom, school, and community context variables.

Part I of the two-part study involved 58 classrooms and 232 target students at six sites. Each of five sites represented students from Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Cantonese, or Navajo ethnolinguistic groups; the sixth site served students from several cultures. During this phase of the study, five features were identified as significant: (a) congruence of instructional intent, organization and delivery of instruction, and student consequences; (b) use of active teaching behaviors; (c) use of the students' native language (L1) and English (L2) for instruction; (d) integration of English language development with basic skills instruction; and (e) use of information from the LEP students' home culture.

Part II of the study sought to verify the features identified in Part I. The Part II sample consisted of 89 classrooms and 356 target students at eight sites, including new sites representing Filipino, Vietnamese, and Hispanic ethnolinguistic groups.

The Part II research indicated that the identified features were prevalent in the study classrooms. During basic skills instruction, English was used by instructors approximately 70 percent of the time while the students' home language was used about 30 percent of the time. The students' home language was used during instruction most often to develop lesson content. The use of substantial amounts of the students' home language was associated with positive learning behaviors for LEP students. Use of information from the LEP students' home cultures appeared to support learning. In general, the implemented form of bilingual instruction was found to be complex, diverse, and frequently influenced by conditions external to the classrooms.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The National Consortium for the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study would like to acknowledge the contributions of the thousands of students and hundreds of classroom teachers who participated in the study. The dedication of the staffs at the nine consortium sites, and the sustained cooperation of district administrators and school principals were critical to the achievement of study goals. Approximately 100 data collectors representing five different language groups were involved in the fieldwork. The study was thoughtfully advised on research and policy issues by a Seminar of Scholars and a Policy Implications Advisory Panel. The talent, energy, and perseverance of all of these contributors is deeply appreciated.

During the analysis and reporting phases of the study there was substantive and editorial input from a wide range of people. The Consortium is especially grateful for the many contributions of the site project directors: Migdalia Romero and Ana Maria Villegas (New York); Maria Masud and Alicia Rojas (Florida); Ana Macias (Texas); Gail Goodman (Arizona); Larry F. Guthrie, John Lum, and Kalei Inn (Oakland, California); Joaquin Armendariz and Christine Baker (San Francisco, California); Astacia Wright (Illinois); Felipe Paris (Oregon); and Milagros Gavieres (Hawaii). The Consortium also acknowledges the special contributions of Elsie Gee for her organizational ability, high energy, constructive criticism, and perseverance in the planning, conduct, and management of the study, Carolyn Arnold, Mark Phillips, and Christine Baker for data analysis, Becky McReynolds for a broad range of editorial work, and Raquel Castillo, Patricia Ferman, Peter Grace and Rosemary De La Torre for coordination of document production.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgment	v
Introduction	1
Overview of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study	1
Identification of Significant Features of Bilingual Instruction	2
Verification of the Features of Bilingual Instruction	3
Replication studies	3
Stability studies	4
Stability of instruction: following teachers	5
Stability of instruction: following students	5
Utility study	6
Compatibility study	7
Commentary on the Findings of the Study	7
Summary of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Descriptive Study Findings	11
Appendix A: List of Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study Reports	15

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Language Proficiency of Limited English Proficient Students	9
2	Language Characteristics of Classes	10

Introduction

Provision of educational services for limited English proficient (LEP) students in the United States is an increasingly important issue for educational policy makers and practitioners. Although the education of language minority students has a long history in this country, renewed interest and urgency in the past twenty years has led to the development of a variety of approaches for serving LEP students. One of the more frequently occurring approaches is usually referred to as bilingual education. This report summarizes a three-year investigation of the important instructional features of bilingual education and their consequences for LEP students.

The major goals of bilingual education for LEP students are (a) acquisition of proficiency in English and (b) continued acquisition of knowledge in the various subject matter content areas. Depending upon local conditions, the priority that school districts place on these goals relative to other goals of education may vary considerably from one district to another, and sometimes from one school to another within the same district. The hallmark of bilingual education is the use of two languages for instruction. In spite of this common characteristic, however, delivery of instruction to LEP students differs greatly from site to site when viewed at close range. This study examined instruction of LEP students at nine geographically separate, ethnolinguistic sites. The study looked at the organization of instruction, allocation of time, types of teaching behaviors, amount and function of language use, and other instructional characteristics for students who exhibited various levels of oral language proficiency (both in their home language and in English).

The primary goal of the study was to describe the classroom instruction being provided for LEP students and to characterize the important features of that instruction. Although aspects of classroom instruction constituted the focus of data collection, considerable effort was directed to description and understanding of the larger contexts within which each classroom operated.

The remainder of this executive summary provides an overview of the study, a general discussion and interpretation of the results, and a summary of the findings. A list of the several dozen technical reports on which this document is based is included as Appendix A.

Overview of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study

The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) descriptive study was one of several research activities guided by the Part C Research Agenda for Bilingual Education in direct response to a

Congressional mandate issued in 1978. In search of data to inform the consideration for renewal of support for bilingual education, Congress directed the Secretary of Education to develop a national research program for bilingual education. In turn, the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) were instructed to coordinate this research program.

In October 1980, NIE funded the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWLERD), and a consortium of eight other nationally prominent educational institutions and agencies, to conduct a descriptive study of significant features of bilingual instruction. The results of this three-year investigation were intended to provide important information to understand and subsequently to increase opportunities for successful participation by LEP students in the instructional process.

The SBIF descriptive study was conducted in two major parts. The first part of the study, which took place during the 1980-81 school year, was designed to identify, describe, and analyze significant instructional features in bilingual settings and the consequences of those features for LEP students. The second part, which commenced with the 1981-82 school year, proposed to verify the Part I findings. Verification was approached in four ways: by examining (a) the replicability of the findings in other ethnolinguistic groups and geographic areas; (b) the stability of the findings for participating teachers and students; (c) the utility of the findings for practitioners of bilingual education; and (d) their compatibility with other research.

Identification of Significant Features of Bilingual Instruction

The first part of the study involved six sites in five states: New York, Florida, Texas, Arizona, and California. Five of the sites represented groups with different ethnolinguistic backgrounds --Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Chinese, and Navajo; the sixth site was multilingual.

A key feature of Part I of the study was that it focused on bilingual instructional settings nominated as successful rather than on classes selected as representative of bilingual programs in general. All classrooms included in the sample were nominated as successful by local constituents--administrators, teachers, parents, and former students. This approach was chosen because it was believed that significant features of bilingual instruction would be most evident in the classes of teachers perceived by those involved with bilingual education as the most successful bilingual instructors. Ten classrooms were selected at five of the sites; eight were selected in Texas. Four target students were then identified in each of these 58 classrooms for a total of 232 target students.

A variety of data collection strategies were employed, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Structured observations of instruction produced quantitative measurements of instructional organization, time allocation to content areas and languages, language use, and student engagement in instructional tasks. These quantitative data yielded frequency distributions for a wide range of variables associated with bilingual instruction.

Methods of qualitative observation and analysis yielded descriptions of instruction and student participation. Participating teachers played a major role in analysis of the qualitative data. At each of the sites, they met and analyzed narrative protocols describing their own instruction and the participation of their students. In addition, data were collected outside the classroom regarding constituents' views of bilingual instruction and the community contexts of the study classrooms and schools.

Through these procedures, five features of successful bilingual instruction were identified: (a) congruence of instructional intent, organization and delivery of instruction, and student consequences; (b) use of active teaching behaviors; (c) use of the students' native language (L1) and English (L2) for instruction; (d) integration of English language development with basic skills instruction; and (e) use of information from the LEP students' home culture.

Verification of the Features of Bilingual Instruction

During Part II of the SBIF descriptive study, the replicability, stability, utility, and compatibility of the features identified in Part I were explored in a series of substudies. With slight refinements and modifications, the procedures used in the first part of the study were employed here as well. Both quantitative and qualitative information on the context and process of instruction was collected.

Part II of the study involved 356 target students in 89 classrooms at eight sites. Filipino, Vietnamese, and other Hispanic groups were added to the study in this second phase at sites in Illinois, Oregon, and Hawaii. The Part II sample included some of the classrooms nominated as successful the previous year, as well as other, unnominated classrooms.

Replication studies. Replication of the features identified in Part I was carried out in two ways: (a) by study of a second sample of classrooms nominated as successful bilingual instructional settings, but serving different ethnolinguistic groups than those in the first part; and (b) by study of classrooms that, while serving LEP students, were not nominated as successful and where the instruction was not necessarily bilingual.

The first substudy attempted to replicate the findings from Part I in a new sample of 21 nominated classes at two sites (Illinois and Hawaii) not examined during Part I. The second verification substudy examined non-nominated classes to determine the characteristic in-

structional features of a somewhat broader group of classes serving LEP students. This second substudy sample included 46 classes at six sites; five of these sites (New York, Florida, Texas, Arizona, and California) had participated in Part I of the study, and one site (Oregon) was new.

The results of the first substudy indicated that the five features were, to varying degrees, replicated at the two new sites. The presence of congruence of intent, organization and delivery of instruction, and student consequences was partially supported. Active teaching behaviors were used extensively. Two languages were used for instruction, most frequently to differentiate instruction for individual students. Some evidence for the integration of English language development with basic skills instruction and for the use of information from the LEP students' culture also was found.

A comparison of the findings from both substudies indicated that the ratings of active teaching were consistently high in both nominated and unnominated samples of classes. No strong relation between ratings on active teaching and proportion of L1 use during basic skills instruction was detected. More time was allocated to basic skills instruction in the non-nominated sample but this difference was apparently related to district level changes rather than to nomination status or use of L1. The organization of classroom instruction in both samples was highly structured and tended to be teacher-centered.

The use of L1 in the classes of the Part I sample compared to that in the unnominated verification substudy sample of Part II was, to a great extent, a function of sampling strategy. L1 use was somewhat greater in the nominated sample than in the non-nominated sample. There was wide variation in usage, however, within both samples. In the unnominated sample, there was some evidence that use of both languages for instruction had positive consequences for LEP students if the proportion of L1 use was substantial.

There was evidence also that the features of integration of language development with basic skills instruction and use of information from the students' nome culture were present in both nominated and unnominated samples. The degree of similarity in the two samples was not unexpected since students and most of the classes in both samples had come from the same schools. In addition, the students in the unnominated sample had been in well-run bilingual programs in the previous school year.

Stability studies. In Part II of the SBIF study, stability of the instructional system and process was examined across two academic years. To accomplish this, two more substudies were carried out. The first substudy examined teachers over two academic years. The same 10 teachers were studied in both years but, of course, they had different classes of students in Year One and Year Two. The

second substudy focused on the stability of LEP students' participation in bilingual instruction. Eighty-five students from the Part I sample were followed to their new classrooms and studied in Part II as well.

Stability of instruction: following teachers. The first stability substudy included two teachers from each of the five continuing Part I sites. Data were examined for six aspects of instruction : instructional organization, time allocation, active teaching, use of language and culture, curriculum intent, and teacher's sense of efficacy. Data collected in Year One were compared to Year Two data in order to determine the stability/instability of selected aspects of instruction. Analysis was conducted at two levels. First, case studies were developed for each of the teachers. Second, a cross-cases analysis was carried out.

Teachers allocated more time to instruction in reading/language arts in Year Two than they had in Year One. For most of the teachers, higher ratings for active teaching behaviors were recorded in Year Two. During instruction in basic skills, teachers appeared to use more English and less L1 in Year Two than in Year One. Along with this change, came an increase in the use of English language materials and a decrease in the use of materials in the students' first language. Of the six aspects of instruction studied, teachers were least consistent in their organization of learning activities.

Teachers' behavior appeared to be stable in regard to the frequency with which they alternated languages during instruction. On the average, instructors changed languages 84 times per day in Year One and 89 times per day in Year Two. However, the proportion of language alternations that were intended to develop the substance of the instruction, rather than clarify management procedures or provide feedback about classroom behaviors, increased from Year One to Year Two. This increase was accompanied by increases in oral use of English, allocation of instructional time to reading/language arts, and degree of emphasis on academic matters. Those instructors who declined in observer ratings of classroom management exhibited an increase of language changes for behavioral feedback purposes. In general, there was stability in terms of instructors' curriculum intent and sense of efficacy.

In some cases, factors external to the classroom were altered during the course of this study. For several of the teachers, changes in district policies on testing and teacher assignment appeared to influence classroom decisions.

Stability of instruction: following students. The second substudy of instructional stability examined the experiences of a sample of LEP students over a two-year period. Eighty-five target students from five of the Part I sites were identified and followed into their classes in the second year. Stability of classroom context, instructional process, and student performance was examined using a variety of observational data collected in both years.

Data were analyzed from two perspectives. First, frequency distributions were calculated and examined for the overall sample and at the site level. In this analysis, classroom context variables appeared to be relatively stable from Year One to Year Two. Instructional process variables, however, were less stable. The proportion of basic skills time allocated to L1, for example, showed a decline at all but one site. Since some students moved into nonbilingual classrooms in the second year, this was not unexpected. Across the two years, language changes related to substantive instruction increased while language changes for directions or behavioral feedback decreased. Despite these deviations in instructional process, student performance variables remained rather stable. Both percent time engaged and percent time on high accuracy tasks, for example, either stayed about the same or increased.

In the second analysis, comparisons were made between the experiences of (a) students whose teachers in both years showed consistently high L1 use; and (b) students whose Year One teachers used L1 a high proportion of the time, but whose Year Two teachers used it considerably less. Grade level and oral English proficiency were included in the analysis. For most students, classroom context variables appeared to be unrelated to the teachers' use of L1. For kindergarten-first grade students with low oral English proficiency, however, a reduction in L1 use was concomitant with reduction in the proportion of time allocated to reading, math, and whole group instruction. Instructional process variables showed a relatively stable pattern for all students, with one exception. For first grade students, the average frequency of language changes increased or decreased with the proportion of L1 use. Analysis of the student performance variables showed that first grade students with low oral proficiency in English assigned to classes with less L1 use were the only group to show a reduction in the proportion of time engaged. Percent time on high accuracy tasks, on the other hand, remained relatively constant regardless of L1 use. Teachers' integration of English language development in basic skills instruction and the use of cultural referents were relatively stable across the two years of the study.

Utility study. The utility of the bilingual instructional features identified in Part I of the SBIF study was examined in a series of meetings with teachers of LEP students, teacher educators, administrators of bilingual education programs, and others interested in the instruction of LEP students. Participants at utility meetings considered the Part I study findings from three perspectives: (a) their usefulness for improving instruction for LEP students; (b) their potential for implementation in instructional programs; and (c) their appropriateness for various ethnolinguistic groups. Utility meetings were held at each of the study sites.

The meeting participants found the five significant instructional features identified during Part I to be useful for describing bilingual educational settings. They indicated that the features could have important implications for policy regarding instruction

and testing. With regard to implementation, the participants suggested that information on four aspects of the study could be useful in teacher training. These aspects were: (a) the five SBIF study features; (b) the data collection strategies; (c) the descriptive data on bilingual instruction; and (d) the inquiry process utilized in the study. The participants also considered the applicability of the findings to various ethnolinguistic groups. They recommended that (a) cultural information regarding all LEP student groups at a school be collected and disseminated to all concerned persons (teachers, principals, district administrators, parents); (b) awareness of the various ways in which competent student participation is accomplished be encouraged; and (c) LEP students' cultural norms and values be used to support the development of their basic skills.

Compatibility study. To determine the compatibility of the Part I SBIF findings with current research in a variety of relevant fields, five papers were commissioned from well-known education researchers. The authors focused on the SBIF findings from Part I in relation to their own research and to other research with which they were familiar. An emphasis was placed on examining policy development issues that had emerged during Part I. The papers discussed these topics: Active Teaching, Teacher Expectations, and Student Perceptions in Regular and Bilingual Settings (Thomas L. Good); Effective Language Use in Bilingual Classes (Lily Wong Fillmore); Second Language Acquisition in School Settings (Christina Bratt Paulston); Implications of the SBIF Descriptive Study for Teacher Education (George Blanco); and Functional Language Proficiency in Context: Classroom Participation as an Interactive Process (James Cummins).

The papers were presented in Washington, DC, in February, 1983, at a meeting of practitioners, policy developers, legislative representatives, personnel from federal, state, and local education agencies and others interested in the study. They were later assembled as a single SBIF study report.

Commentary on the Findings of the Study

Part I of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features descriptive study identified five major features of bilingual instruction. These features were examined through four very different "lenses" during Part II of the study. In an attempt to integrate the findings and gain insight into their meaning, the following discussion considers three general points.

First, high quality instruction for LEP students shares a great deal with high quality instruction in general. There are, however, additional instructional features that support high quality instruction for LEP students. Two of the identified features (congruence of instructional intent, organization of instruction, and student consequences; and use of active teaching behaviors) appear to characterize high quality instruction regardless of the first language of the students. It seems clear, both from the Part I findings and

from the replication, stability, utility, and compatibility studies carried out in Part II, that "congruence" and "active teaching" were present in the classrooms nominated as successful bilingual settings. These features were relatively stable over time, were considered useful by practitioners, and were found to be compatible with research findings in related fields--although there was somewhat more empirical support for "active teaching" than for "congruence." The point here is that these features appear to be important characteristics of quality instruction in general.

The other identified features (use of two languages for instruction; integration of English language development with basic skills instruction; and use of information from the students' nome culture) were also supported in varying degrees by the verification activities of Part II. These features are crucial to the instruction of LEP students since they deal directly with aspects of minority language and culture.

Thus appropriate instruction for LEP students would seem to require not only the characteristics of quality instruction in general, but also additional characteristics that are especially relevant for limited English speakers. One implication of this statement may be that teachers of LEP students will require more, or at least different training and support than teachers in monolingual English settings.

The second general point to keep in mind is that the population of LEP students and the contexts of their schooling are extremely diverse. Bilingual and other specially tailored instructional approaches for LEP students are intended to take into account LEP students' different needs; the intent of such instruction is to increase LEP students' opportunities for learning. A classroom containing LEP students, however, is typically more heterogeneous than a classroom containing monolingual English students. Variations in LEP student characteristics are very likely to influence the organization and delivery of instruction. Before specifying particular uses of L1 and cultural information in school settings, educators must acknowledge and allow for major contextual differences in school sites serving LEP students. For example, the type of language, status of L1, size and degree of isolation of the L1 group, and other social and historical background factors give rise to very diverse contexts within which schools must operate.

Many different home languages are represented in the population of LEP students in the United States. Some of these languages have similar structural characteristics to English, while others have very little in common with English. The degree of commonality between a student's home language and English, at least at a very general level, can be expected to affect the rate of acquisition of English. For languages based on the same alphabet as English, it may be appropriate to encourage literacy in both L1 and English. On the other hand, for languages with a character-based orthography, there is some controversy regarding whether or not to teach writing

in L1. It is easy to see how this issue alone, the inclusion or exclusion of L1 literacy in the curriculum, can lead to very different instructional activities for LEP students with different L1 backgrounds.

The status of home languages within a given community also varies greatly and may affect the manner and rate of acquisition of English. Not long ago, speakers of some languages were forbidden to use their home language in school. The social and historical background of the L1 group strongly affects the status of a given language, and status differentials between English and home languages affect both the manner in which instruction is undertaken and the motivation of LEP students to learn English.

A related social factor affecting LEP students is the size of the local L1 population. The motivations of LEP students for acquiring English in different situations are likely to have strong effects on language acquisition. In some cases, LEP students live in large economically viable communities of L1 speakers. In these situations students are likely to have access to newspapers, television, and other media in their home language. In other cases, LEP students may be relatively isolated linguistically. For example, in the last decade southeast Asians have been dispersed in small groups to towns and cities throughout the United States. LEP students from these groups must use English exclusively in interactions outside their immediate families.

A third general point concerns the implications of students' various levels of language proficiency for the design and delivery of instruction. Partly as a result of experiences in widely differing contexts, LEP students differ greatly on the degree of proficiency in both their home language and English. Consider the fourfold table obtained by dichotomizing levels of development in L1 and English (Table 1). Although the table oversimplifies the

Table 1

Language Proficiency of Limited English Proficient Students

		Proficiency in English: Low	Proficiency in English: High
Proficiency in L1	Low	Quadrant B	Quadrant A
	High	Quadrant C	Quadrant D

situation, students can be categorized in one of the four quadrants. Students in Quadrant A are characterized by a high level of proficiency in English and a relatively low level of proficiency in L1 and are often referred to as being English dominant. Students in Quadrant B are characterized by relatively low proficiency in both English and L1. The other two quadrants represent students who are L1 dominant (Quadrant C) or bilingual (Quadrant D). If the goals of an educational program are focused on the simultaneous acquisition of English and subject matter knowledge, then instruction in English would seem to be appropriate for students in the two right-hand quadrants. Students who fell into the two left-hand quadrants (the LEP students) were the focus of the SBIF descriptive study.

If students could be grouped homogeneously in school according to their proficiencies in L1 and English, then we could pause here and examine the effects of various configurations of bilingual instruction on specific groups of LEP students. Classroom instruction, however, involves groups of up to 40 students having different combinations of L1 and L2 proficiencies. In some classes, the vast majority of students may be L1 dominant, while in other classes only a few students may have a home language other than English. Since almost all school instruction is delivered by oral or written language, student language proficiency will play a primary role in determining what and how much students learn. Any instructional strategy developed for a homogeneous group must be modified to accommodate large variations in language proficiency among students.

Furthermore, one classroom may have several non-English languages represented among its LEP students. Table 2 presents another simplified classification of classrooms based on the distribution of L1 speakers in the class. Quadrant I represents classrooms in which there is a high proportion of LEP students and all of the LEP students have the same home language. Classes in Quadrant II are

Table 2

Language Characteristics of Classes

		Proportion of LEP students in class	
		Low	High
Number of non-English Languages Represented	One (Bilingual Setting)	Quadrant II	Quadrant I
	More than one (Multilingual Setting)	Quadrant III	Quadrant IV

composed of English speakers with a few same-language LEP students. Classes in Quadrant III are also composed of English speakers and a small number of LEP students, but two or more non-English home languages are represented. Quadrant IV represents classes with high proportions of LEP students from two or more non-English home languages and few or no students with English as a home language. Presumably there are fewer classes in Quadrant IV than in Quadrant III, and many classes in Quadrants I and II compared to Quadrants III and IV.

The practical and theoretical considerations affecting instructional design and delivery are very different in the four quadrants represented in Table 2. The grouping of students, provision of materials with appropriate language characteristics, languages spoken and understood by teachers and aides, sequencing of curriculum components, and provision of equitable testing practices are some of the issues that could be handled differently from quadrant to quadrant.

The vast majority of classes included in the SBIF descriptive study fell in Quadrant I (see Table 2). A few classes from Quadrant IV were included in Part I at Site 6. Therefore, leaving aside other sampling concerns for the moment, the findings of the study are directly relevant only to those contexts where there are two languages involved and where LEP students make up a sizable portion of the students in a class. The findings of the study, especially the quantitative and qualitative descriptions provided in the technical reports, may or may not characterize classes in Quadrants II, III and IV.

This commentary has briefly identified some characteristics of the school context, of individual LEP students, and of classrooms serving LEP students that are likely to require differentiation of instructional design and delivery. Although the discussion is far from complete, it should be clear that LEP students are a very heterogeneous group and that LEP students are taught in widely differing classroom contexts. Both of these factors mitigate the possibility that any one instructional arrangement will be effective in all cases.

The features identified in Part I of the SBIF descriptive study were relatively general, reflecting the study's wide variety of instructional contexts and arrangements. In order to obtain specific instructional strategies for specific settings, it is necessary to attend very closely to the local context.

Summary of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Descriptive Study Findings

The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features descriptive study investigated a broad range of contextual and instructional factors in multiple classrooms at widely separated geographic sites over a three-year period. In general, the study examined established

bilingual instructional settings with highly reputed, experienced teachers. Detailed descriptions of the study and its findings are available in a series of technical reports (see Appendix A). This brief summary includes some results and implications of the study.

First, it appeared that well-run bilingual instruction shared many characteristics with high quality monolingual classroom instruction. These shared characteristics included (but were not limited to) a strong focus on academic work, high allocation of time to subject matter content, use of active teaching practices, expression of high expectations for student performance, efficient classroom management, and congruence between teacher intent and organization of instruction.

Second, although the use of two languages for instruction is an obvious feature of bilingual education, the SBIF study provided evidence regarding the amount and function of the languages used. For example, evidence indicated that substantial amounts of the students' native language (L1)--amounts beyond token usage--were associated with positive learning behaviors for limited English proficient (LEP) students. The LEP students' L1 was used by instructors an average of about 30 percent of the time during basic skills instruction, but there was much variation in L1 use across classes. When bilingual instructors changed from English to L1 or from L1 to English during instruction, the purpose was most often to develop the lesson content, rather than to give directions or feedback on inappropriate behavior. Bilingual instructors used L1 most often with subgroups of the class or individual students, thereby adjusting the task difficulty for LEP students. Bilingual instructors' decisions about use of L1 and English were more often influenced by cues from the ongoing instructional activity than by preplanned strategies for language use. In addition, the study found that bilingual instructors infrequently used materials in the students' L1 because few materials were available.

It appears that the instruction of students with a home language other than English demands sophisticated linguistic skills in addition to the pedagogical and content expertise normally required of competent teachers. Thus, an implication of the SBIF study may be that teachers of LEP students, in order to provide appropriate and equitable services to their students, need more training and support than do teachers of monolingual English students.

Third, the use of L1 cultural information during instruction occurred frequently in the study classrooms. The use of L1 in itself is an influential carrier of cultural information. The mechanisms by which this information (such as cultural referents or values and norms) supported learning, however, were not obvious. Despite the lack of direct evidence in support of the practice, participants in the SBIF utility study seemed to feel that students benefited by the use of cultural information; they suggested that the use of L1 cultural information allowed students to work with concepts about which they had firsthand experience and to identify more strongly with the instructor, reduced discontinuities between

home and school, and lessened possible status differences in languages--thereby increasing motivation for learning.

In general, the bilingual instruction examined by the SBIF study was diverse and complex. In some situations, for example, aides were provided for bilingual teachers; in others, L1-speaking aides were linked with monolingual English-speaking teachers. A third pattern consisted of two teachers, one bilingual and one monolingual, who alternated as instructors on a half-day or every-other-day basis. The broad nature of the features identified during Part I reflected the SBIF study's wide variety of instructional contexts and arrangements. Although there were commonalities at the level of the identified features, the implementation of instruction depended heavily on the language group being served and the local educational context.

APPENDIX

SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES STUDY REPORTS: PARTS I AND II

SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES
STUDY REPORTS: PART I

1. Title: Overview of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study (63 pgs.)
   Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

2. Title: Description of the Study (4 pgs.)
   Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

3. Title: Review of the Literature for a Descriptive Study of Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (162 pgs.)
   Author(s): William J. Tikunoff, Beatrice A. Ward, Charles W. Fisher, Joaquin Armendariz, Leann Parker, Domingo Dominguez, Jose A. Vazquez, Carmen Mercado, Migdalia Romero, Thomas A. Good

4. Title: Research Design: Part I of the SBIF Study (226 pgs.)
   Author(s): William J. Tikunoff, Beatrice A. Ward, Charles Fisher, Joaquin Armendariz, John Mergendoller, Elsie Gee, Jose Vazquez, Carmen Mercado, Migdalia Romero, Domingo Dominguez, Steven Bossert, Thomas Good

5. Title: Sample Description and Data Gathering Schedules: Part I of the SBIF Study (53 pgs.)
   Author(s): Charles Fisher, Elsie Gee, Joaquin Armendariz, Domingo Dominguez, Gail Goodman, Roger Kaufman, Sau-Lim Tsang, Jose Vazquez

6. Title: Training Manual for Data Collection: SBIF Study
   Author(s): William Tikunoff, Beatrice Ward, Charles Fisher, Elsie Gee, John Mergendoller

7. Title: Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study: A Report of the State-of-the-Study (27 pgs.)
   Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

8. Title: Preliminary Analysis of the Data for Part I of the SBIF Study (286 pgs.)
   Author(s): William J. Tikunoff, Charles W. Fisher, Beatrice A. Ward, Joaquin C. Armendariz, Elsie Gee, Mark Phillips, Martha Vernazza, Christine Baker, Margaret Boothroyd, Jose A. Vazquez, Migdalia Romero, Ana Villegas, John Lum, Larry Guthrie, Ana Macias

9. Title: Volume I: Introduction and Overview of Part I of the SBIF Study (126 pgs.)
   Author(s): Larry F. Guthrie, William J. Tikunoff, Charles W. Fisher, Elsie W. Gee

10. Title: Volume II: Success Indicators and Consequences for Limited English-Language Proficient Students in the SBIF Study (197 pgs.)
Author(s): W. J. Tikunoff, M. Vernazza, M. L. Phillips, J. Armendariz, C. Baker, G. Goodman, L. F. Guthrie, J. B. Lum, A. H. Macias, J. A. Martin, M. D. Masud, M. Romero, Sau-Lim Tsang, J. M. Tsosie, A. M. Villegas

11. Title: Volume III.1: Bilingual Instructional Perspectives: Organization of Bilingual Instruction in the Classrooms of the SBIF Study (321 pgs.)
Author(s): Charles W. Fisher, William J. Tikunoff, Beatrice A. Ward, Elsie W. Gee, Mark L. Phillips

12. Title: Volume III.2: Bilingual Instructional Perspectives: Allocation of Time in the Classrooms of the SBIF Study (156 pgs.)
Author(s): Charles W. Fisher, William J. Tikunoff, Elsie W. Gee, Mark L. Phillips

13. Title: Volume IV: Teaching in Successful Bilingual Instructional Settings (137 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

14. Title: Volume V: Consequences for Students in Successful Bilingual Instructional Settings (137 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

15. Title: Appendix A.1: Macro-Level Context Report: Site 1 (85 pgs.)
Author(s): Jose Vazquez, Ana Maria Villegas, Migdalia Romero

16. Title: Appendix A.2: Macro-Level Context Report: Site 2
Author(s): Alicia Rojas, Maria Masud

17. Title: Appendix A.3: Macro-Level Context Report: Site 3 (87 pgs.)
Author(s): Tomas Rodriguez, Ana Huerta-Macias

18. Title: Appendix A.4: Macro-Level Context Report: Site 4 (139 pgs.)
Author(s): Gail Goodman, Judy Martin, Jimmy Tsosie

19. Title: Appendix A.5: Macro-Level Context Report: Site 5 (95 pgs.)
Author(s): Larry F. Guthrie, John B. Lum

20. Title: Appendix A.6: Macro-Level Context Report: Site 6 (72 pgs.)
Author(s): Joaquin C. Armendariz, Christine Baker

21. Title: Appendix B.1: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Kindergarten: Site 1 (189 pgs.)
Author(s): Migdalia Romero, Ana Villegas

22. Title: Appendix B.2: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Combined Grades 1 & 2: Site 1 (251 pgs.)
Author(s): Ana Maria Villegas, Migdalia Romero

23. Title: Appendix B.3: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Combined Grades 2 & 3: Site 2 (133 pgs.)
Author(s): Alicia M. Rojas, Maria D. Masud, Maria Elia Fuentes, Berta Rodriguez, Francisco Rodriguez, Emilio Suarez

24. Title: Appendix B.4: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Grade 2: Site 3 (125 pgs.)
Author(s): Ana Huerta-Macias

25. Title: Appendix B.5: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Navajo) in Grade 1: Site 4 (144 pgs.)
Author(s): Gail Goodman, Eugenia Baldwin, Judy Martin, Jimmy Tsosie

26. Title: Appendix B.6: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Cantonese) in Grade 5: Site 5 (160 pgs.)
Author(s): Larry F. Guthrie

27. Title: Appendix B.7: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Cantonese) in Grade 5: Site 5 (179 pgs.)
Author(s): John B. Lum

28. Title: Appendix B.8: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Grade 1: Site 6 (121 pgs.)
Author(s): Christine Baker, Margaret Boothroyd

29. Title: Appendix B.9: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Combined Grades 3, 4, & 5: Site 6 (147 pgs.)
Author(s): Christine Baker, Margaret Boothroyd

30. Title: Executive Summary of Part I of the SBIF Study (34 pgs)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES
STUDY REPORTS: PART II

31. Title: Selection Criteria for Identifying Instructional Features and Student Consequences for Use in Part II of the SBIF Study (13 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

32. Title: Accommodation of the Seminar of Scholars' Recommendations for the Part II Research Design (68 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

33. Title: Research Design: Part II of the SBIF Study (160 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff, Charles W. Fisher, Larry F. Guthrie, Elsie W. Gee in collaboration with Consortium Principal Investigators and their staffs

34. Title: Site and Sample Description, SBIF Study: Part II (117 pgs.)
Author(s): Larry F. Guthrie, Becky S. McReynolds, Charles W. Fisher

35. Title: Verification of Bilingual Instructional Features (161 pgs.)
Author(s): Charles W. Fisher, Larry F. Guthrie, Ellen B. Mandinach

36. Title: Stability of Instructional System and Process for a Sample of Ten Bilingual Teachers in the SBIF Study (286 pgs.)
Author(s): Ana Maria Villegas

37. Title: Stability of Instructional System and Process for a Sample of Eighty-Five Students in the SBIF Study (78 pgs.)
Author(s): Larry F. Guthrie, Charles W. Fisher

38. Title: Utility of the SBIF Features for the Instruction of LEP Students (74 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

39. Title: Compatibility of the SBIF Features with Other Research on Instruction for LEP Students (152 pgs.)
Author(s): William J. Tikunoff

40. Title: Executive Summary: The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study (21 pgs.)
Author(s): Charles W. Fisher, Larry F. Guthrie